

REMARKS

The Examiner indicated that claims 7-18 and 20 are allowed. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowed subject matter.

The Examiner indicated that "[c]laims 2, 3 and 5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims". Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter, and have so rewritten claims 2, 3, and 5 in independent form.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Degani U.S. Patent No. 6,342,399.

Applicants respectfully traverse the §102(b) rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Degani U.S. Patent No. 6,342,399.

Since claims 4 and 6 have each been amended to depend from allowable claim 5, and since claim 5 has been rewritten in independent form so as to be in condition for allowance, Applicants maintain that claims 4 and 6 are likewise in condition for allowance.

As to claim 1, Applicants respectfully contend that Degani does not anticipate claim 1, because Degani does not teach each and every feature of claim 1. For example, Degani does not teach the feature: "a solder member disposed between the first pad and the second pad such that the solder member electrically couples the first pad to the second pad, wherein a portion of the solder member is in direct mechanical contact with the semiconductor substrate". Applicants note that the preceding feature of claim 1 is depicted in FIG. 1 of the present patent application.

The Examiner argues: "Pertaining to claim 1, Degani teaches an electronic structure, comprising: a semiconductor substrate 51 having a first electrically conductive pad 17/31 thereon, wherein a surface area of the first pad exceeds a surface area of the second pad (i.e., the pad that couples solder bump 52)".

In response, Applicant notes that in FIG. 12 of Degani, no portion of the solder member 52 is in direct mechanical contact with the semiconductor substrate 51.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Degani does not anticipate claim 1, and that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0457.

Date: 03/08/2005

Schneiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688